Editor
The New Statesman
London, England

7627 Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21702
11/10/91

Dear Editor,

While I intend this letter for John Pilger, I have no recent address for him and, because there is so much controversy about the coming Oliver Stone film what I say about it, from personal knowledge, not from sources, may interest you.

I'll appreciate your forwarding this to him, along with an enclosed separate and private letter. If any of what I say herein is of interest to you, please feel free to use it with one restriction: nothing I say is intended to be critical of John and I do not want it misused that way. I can identify his sources, almost without exception, and he was back in 1968 quite justified in considering them dependable sources.

If you know any others who may be interested in this subject, I'll respond to any questions until 8 p.m. our time. I am now 78, in seriously impaired health, cannot help rising early, and not long after 8 I should be abed.

If you or any in the British press who may be interested have Washington correspondents, they are welcome to all the information I have and the use of our copier.

My apologies to you and to John from my typing. I do not want to delay and the ends of my fingers are split. and as John may remember, my vision was not good when we spent some time together in New Orleans and in Dallas, where he was preparing for an article to appear on the fifth anniversary of the JFK assassination. I still remember some of his kindnesses then.

Dear John, to the compliments you paid Jim Garrison you could well have said that he is one of the most charming of men, so personable, so eloquent, so persuasive. I, like you and so many others, was quite persuaded by all he said and like you I trusted him, believed him and had no doubt that the charges he had filed were the result of an excellent investigation by him. Because my interest when I was in New Orleans was in Oswald, I never questioned him about his Shaw case. I surely should have, alas!

But the tragic truth as I was so late learning is that he is an unabashed and uninhibited a liar as in 78 years I have ever known. The ghastly fact is that he just made it up as he went and never conducted what can reasonably be called an investigation at all.

I think I can anticipate how you feel by now but please keep an open mind. I think you'll soon see enough to understand and perhaps be shocked.

As you may remember, when you were then in New Orleans I was staying with our friend Matt Herron. You should remember that one night when it was rather warm and I got up from a mattrass on the floor while quite exhausted from so little sleep I passed out and in falling demolished Matt's harpsichord. When I came to it was you hovering over me. I still remember and appreciate your concern.

You and Matt left Dallas the day before I wanted to. You were kind enough to let me use your rented car. I had a minor accident with it in the airport traffic the next day. You may not remember it but I was ill and planned to fly home from Dallas. But Garrison phoned me. - just had to return to New Orleans. He had the most important piece of evidence yet and - in particular just had to see it. He said he'd have Matt meet me at the airport. So, I was on the evening plane and Matt did meet me.

We had a long wait at the airport. That was one of the two times my baggage was intercepted and we waited for it. Matt stopped off at the Palais Royal on Airline and I bought enought clothing and toilet articles to tide me over. So, after what Garrison had me return for, I had to await the delivery of my intercepted luggage. Fortunately!

The next morning, for this promised moment of moments, I was in Garrison's office with some of his staff and Bill Turner, a Warren Commission witness, Charles Hall Steele II, and a movie projector.

With what he regarded as an appropriate explanation of just why this sensation we were about to enjoy was so significant, he had one of his detectives turn the projector on. He started to project an exceptionally poor copy of what remained of the WDSU-TV film of Oswald, including his literature distribution outside the International Trade Mart, the old building. Shaw was its general manager.

Not much of it had been projected when I decided that what I was about to offer did not violate an agreement I'd made. So I asked Jim if he would not rather see a clear print. Surprised, he asked it I had it and I took it from what you may remember is a very large attache case.

I do not know what articles you read before writing this piece but if you read me quoted as saying that as an investigator Garrison could not find pubic hair in an overused and undercleaned whore hours - at rush hour, I was quoted correctly. What I now say is a minor illustration of it.

Johann Rush was the WDSU photographer. A Secret Service report states that he gave it 17 prints made from his footage. I was quite surprised that Garrison did not have them so I suggested to Andrew "Moo" Sciambra, the assistant DA closest to Garrison in those days, that with Johann having moved to San Francisco, he might ask his parents in Shreveport if he'd left copies with them. When I learned that Garrison also had not even seen the film I went to WDSU. Its news director, Ed Planer, let me make a copy with two restrictions, that I respect their copyright and not let Garrison have it. On learning that Johann had not left the film with his parents Garrison had Sciambra phone the former professional thief for the FBI to whom Garrison was so attached, the very one who planted the phony SDECE film and book on Garrison, Bill Turner (one of the few men Hoover fired), and ask him to get prints of those 17 prints. Turner never asked for them but Rush offered him this poor copy of that footage. I had to learn from WDSU Rush that he'd kept no copies of those 17 prints. The importance of this is that they'd not kept the outtakes.

So, what was this most important of all evidence?

"Stop it! Stop it right right there. No, go back a few frames. There!"

His face as radiant as I'd ever seen it Garrison then pointed to a man walking toward the camera and exclaimed, "That's Shaw!" He then pointed to a door and gloated," That is his secret entrance!"

The man was not Shaw. The door did not open from the street. It was a fire door. and what in the world wcould have been secret about a doorway onto a main street? And why in the world did the building manager, so well-known a man, need any "secret" door?

None of us said anything except as I now recall a bit of his usual sycophancy from Turner, who was one of Garrison's major mobile disasters, details of which I will not now go into.

Garrison then turned to Steele, then a marine home on leave. He is in the film, handing out copies of Oswald's "Hands off Cuba!" sheet. Oswald had hired him for $2.00 in the unemployment-compensation line, to which Steele returned. He questooned Steele, getting less than Steele had testified to before the Warren Commission. When he excused Steele I asked Steele if he'd mind answering a question or two for me. I wanted a second source on something I'd learned and that even the cubbiest of cub reporters ought not have overlooked. But Garrison had.

Jesse Core was the public information officer of the Trade Mart. He had his own p.r. business in that building and he was a close and intimate friend of Shaw's. He had also been campaign manager of Garrison's first campaign. And Garrison never spoke to him about his Shaw "case." It was Core, as the Commission's disclosed records report, who phoned the FBI to complain about Oswald's demonstration.

Core told me -- and Steele confirmed -- that he was one of two young men Oswald had helping him hand those sheets out and that when the camreas left, Oswald ended it.

This is one of many proofs I got of Oswald unreported associates in whom Garrison had no interest at all. Not even that, as I also developed, it was not Oswald who got those sheets from the printer. One demon investigator, Garrison!

I regretted very much having been conned into returning to New Orleans when I'd been away from home a month and was not well until just before I had to leave to catch the plane. I do not know whether they arranged it or whether I blundered into it but I did learn from Sciambra and Louis Ivon of how Garrison planned to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the JFK assassination. They had failed to discourage him, except that another assistant DA, Jim Alcock, later a judge, had gotten him to reduce the commemoration's new charges he was going to file to two men.

Garrison's "identification" came from what was incorrectly known, Garrison being imaginative in making things up, as "the tramp pictures." As of my last knowldge Oliver Stone still inisted on their meaning as invented by Garrison. Again I wont give you all

Grimm brothers details. Ivon, chief investigator, and Sciambra, asked me to try to talk Garrison out of it. I said I'd go home, come back, and try. I also asked for two sets of those pictures and two ~~new~~ envelopes in which to mail them. I addressed and mailed them at the airport, ~~go~~ to two former FBI agents both of whom believed there had been a conspiracy to kill JFK. Neither knew I'd asked the other. Independently, I learned from each the identical story, that those three men were not tramps but were winos; that when after the assassination the police were searching the entire area, they had been found guzzling wine and stinking from it in an empty railroad boxcar parked behind the Central Annex Post office. It was an hour and a half after the assassination. (This is what Garrison had in mind in telling you that some of them hung around after the dirty deed was done.)

They were marched more than three blocks, from behind 217 S. Houston to the triple-underpass and then at a right angle to and past the depository building in front of which JFK had been killed. That was the only way to walk them out. The news photogs were filming everything that moved, including them. A man I'd interested in searching for unknown pictures, Richard Sprague, got copies of them and he and Garrison immediately said they were assassins disguised as tramps, thus the name "Tramp Pictures."

Neither they nor the many others Garrison interested in those pictures, not the least of whom was Mark Lane (now shifted farthur to the right than he'd been to the left) ever mentioned that none of the men was handcuffed and none of the three uniformed officers had his pistol or revolver out. Wouldn't a demon investigator have expected that at least if ~~he~~ they had corraled suspected assassins?

To begin with Garrison "identified" ~~these~~ these three men as the "shooters." No investigation, it just was so because he said it was so. How they could have shot north and then have the shot go sharply east did not concern ~~them~~ Garrison et al until I raised that question. (So, Stone now lies- he can't tell the truth even by accident - and insists they were "arrested," as they were not, just minites after the shooting, and had been found in a railroad passenger car directly behind the depository building.)

Earlier that year, right after Dr. King was killed, a sketch of ~~the~~ his alleged assassin appeared in the papers. It was obviously drawn from the one of those "tramps" Garrison referred to as "French" and later as Lyndon Johnson's farm manager! Perceiving what I did I gave copies of a picture and the sketch to the local FBI agent. That cause an investigation the results of which I got later. I digress to tell you how because it does relate to how authoritatively I speak.

As the result of about a dozen FOIA lawsuits I've gotten about a third of a million pages of once-withheld official records, mostly on the JFK. Most of the rest are on the King assassination. Garrison had no interest in them and I had most of them before he wrote his book. Stone had no interest in them yet he proclaims he has studied all that has come to light. (He is really referring to the many theories, all unproven, most unetable.) All

working in the field know that I give access to all writers, knowing full well that I disagree with what they believe and will write. This includes use of our copier. Anyway, I have the FBI headquarters and Dallas and New Orleans files as a result of several of those lawsuits. I also have their records on me. I got the results of the FBI's investigation of that assassin sketch. It includes interviews with the editors of the papers that own those pictures and with the three men in uniform, one a deputy the other two policemen. They confirm the investigations made for me but in fact they say the boxcar in which those winos were found was even farthur away. In this they erred.

Common sense alone indicated that Garrison was wildly irresponsible, as is Stone, Stone more so because he knows the truth, and with this proof of what a monstrous fraud Garrison ~~he~~ was about to demean the fifth assassination anniversary with I ~~cooled him of (as usual, only temporarily) and~~ returned to New Orleans.

I worked with what few records Bill Boxley generated in working directly for Garrison, I used ~~and~~ Ivon and his ~~had~~ investigators, all, like him, policeman. He is also a criminologist. They made for me obvious investigations I asked for and Garrison had not had made.

One of the two men he was about tocharge with being an assassin in 1963 had actaually killed himself in New Orleans in 1962!Robert Perrin. The other was almost as wild. Based on Garrison's false claim that he was one of those three "tramps" ~~men~~ Garrison was also going to charge Edgar Eugene Bradley, the west-coast representative of an ultra-right east-coast preacher, Rev Carl McIntire. Garrison ~~He~~ had not a damned thing on either man to begin with.

Staying at Hatts I worked quite hard and then gave Sciambra a memo that begins by saying that what Boxley did was go out and make up and feed back to Garrison what Harrison had himself made up without a shred of evidence, even rationality.

Garrison was not about to confess so instead he saved his own face by firing Boxley, charging what he knew was false, that the CIA had infiltrated Boxley ~~his staff~~ to wreck his investigation. Garrison has insisted on hiring Boxley over vigorous staff objections and rather than being a city employee, an assistant DA as Stone had it in his original script, paid him from private funds.

The is unrecognixable in Garrison's book, which lies throughout as though his life depended on it.

When knowing just about nothing at all about Stone I learned early this year that he was basing his movie on Garrison's book, I wrote him 4-5000 words and offered him more documentation than I attached, on February 8.He did not respond.

Then someone in his field mailed me a copy of his script. It was wretchedly bad and wrong and quite dishonest.

You have fallen for his manufacture, that the major "establishment" media is out to get him.He knows very well what happened. And I alone, not the CIA or the media, am responsible for it.

I've known George Lardner for 25 years and have often been his source and have not known him to err in any of many stories. He is the reporter the Post sent to New Orleans when the Garrison story broke. (He was an another assignment at the time of the Shaw trial and did not cover it.) George came up, I gave him the script that Stone, knowing it was impossible for me, alleged that I stole, plus a selection of my records of my work in and about New Orleans, and before his story was published he checked it with me. There is no error in it at all. Period.

It is a sensational expose. Nothing else was required to generate other media interest in it. Time did a piece and others have followed. There is a good one in the current Esquire and those writing for other publications have been in touch with me. If you have Lardner's story you's know I am his source. He says so.

This alone gives you a reading on Stone, who conned you and others with his fabrication that the media, the CIA and all who oppose what he is doing to commercialize and exploit that great tragedy are out to get him. He is clever that way, aided by his absence of scruple or principle.

You may not remember it but I suffer the Wordsworthian curse, of being the first. I had more than 100 international rejection of my first book before I then published it and because I was broke had not a penny for any promotion but still made a best seller of it. Without any review in any major publication. This, by the way, is true of all seven books I've published. So I have no reason to be and am not part of that "established" press, which did not even report it when the FOIA was amended in 1974 over one of my lawsuits. The FBI and the CIA hate me and I have no connection with either.

In short, John, you were lied to. Stone had plenty of time to rewrite a new script and he decided not to. He continued with what he knows is a complete fraud although he began by proclaiming that he would be recording their history for the people and would tell them, and I'm using his words, "who" killed their President, "why" and "how". Even after he got my lengthy and detailed letter he continued with this lie so well designed to promote his exploitation. (Why else do you thin he called his company "Camelot" and titled the film which is not about JFK "JFK?" Why do you think he paid fine actors like Ed Asner big fees for walk-on parts? So he could -and did-use their names to validate his monstrous lie. I have instances that he actually wrote.)

This has grown with the detail longer than I'd intended so I skip to where you write that "a principal source for this piece is the excellent monthly, Loot, or "Lies Of Our Times," without other identification I presume you did not have.

It is published by Garrison 's book publisher!

On its staff is Geoffrey Sklar, coauthor with Stone of the script and editor of Garrison's book. He also teaches journalism. Yet he did not checking of Garrison's book at all. He wrote one of the Loot pieces you liked. In it he lies in saying that I am helping Stone. And between them he and Stone know so little about the facts of both the

assassination and of Garrison's "probe" that the original script had two bad guys holding Ferrie's head in the toilet by his ~~hari~~ hair. as I published in "Oswald in New Orleans," to which the publisher, without asking me, asked Garrison to write a foreword, Ferrie had not a hair on his body. He had alopecia totalis!

This issue of "Lies Of Our Times" could not be more appropriately titled. You have no way of knowing it but the series of articles that impressed you are lies, very, very big lies.

Were my health better I'd have written them. I will, if only for the historical record. I've highlighted those articles for when I feel up to it.

Stone has also bought the rights to use a compendium of all the nutty and unproven theories by Jim Harrs, who knows nothing about the established fact of the assassination and has been interested in only these theories. He does not even understand them and even has some of them skewed.

With a single exception, a fine and reputable pathologist on whose name he trades, Stone never mentions the names of those he describes as "respected researchers" he has used. The reason is simple: they are some of those with these absolutely nutty theories! He and Sklar use my name and the late Sylvia Meagher's as helping him. This is a knowing, rotten lie. He knows I am responsible for his being exposed and he has asked nothing at all from me. He tried and failed to buy the right to use Meagher's book from her heir.

You have you own independent means of satisfying yourself that those wretched exploiters are liars in Sklar's atricle.

If Stone had not begun his movie promotion, coinciding with the release of his movie "Doors," and thus promoting both, with the unequivocal representation quoted above, that it is non-fiction, There would be no questioning his right to say anythinge he, Garrison or any others of that ilk just made up. But he did represent what I quote, he did continue to use those very words after I began the exosure of what he is up up to, and there is now nothing he can do than can change it, much as he has from time to time seemed to back off. He has every prospect of deceiving and misleading more people than anything since the Warren Report. And this is the only reason I caused his accurate, quite factual and accurate, exposure.

It was not the "established" press or any government agency and I know of nothing either has done alone this line, ~~that~~ as he and his associated scum allege.

He did not respond the several time he ~~misied~~ misused my name as helping him. After a false response to Gardner that the Post published I wrote him a point-by-point refutation. That time I heard from Jane Rusconi, who signed herself his "research coordinator. " She made a thinly-hidden effort to bribe me. I declined it. You are welcome to copies if you have any further interest.

I recognize you from the sketch, so either the years have been good to you or the artist was. I hope the former. Best wishes, Harold Weisberg

Harold